

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 1-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,745,711 to Kitahara et al. ("Kitahara") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,050 to Kamata et al. ("Kamata"). The above rejections are respectfully traversed, for the following reasons.

The Applicant maintains that Kitahara and Kamata, either individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as directed in independent claims 11, 21, 34, 44, 46-53, 60-63, 67-69, 73 and 77. Specifically, the cited references fail to teach or suggest a system, method, apparatus or computer program that includes a reception side that issues instructions to an image transmission side on the basis of voice detection.

According to the present invention, the transmission side transmits voice data that is received by the reception side. The reception side requests from the transmission side a higher-resolution image, instructs the transmission side to change an image format, or enters a flow for acquiring control right to operate a camera. As a result, the following effects can be obtained. First, the reception side can more selectively request a higher quality image from a specific transmission side. In other words, the reception side can send a request to one transmission side without having to send request to other transmission sides. Thus, line capacity can be saved. Second, the reception side can compare images and voice from other transmission terminals. Third, the reception side can request a higher-quality image from a specific terminal that is considered a more important terminal. Thus, the present invention can secure a line only this terminal, which is believed to be very important in today's communication systems.

Kamata:

In Kamata, since the image of the speaker is displayed in a large size, it is possible to easily know who is speaking. Additionally, if the speaker changes, the image displayed also changes. However, the change in images is performed by changing the display process on the reception terminal. In other words, a specific image request is not sent to the communication partner (i.e., transmission side). In fact, nowhere does Kamata teach or disclose requesting a higher quality image and/or changing from a still image to a moving image on the basis of voice information. For this reason, Kamata is distinguishable from the present invention.

Kitahara:

Kitahara merely discloses that a voice is output from the window on which a mouse cursor is overlaid, but fails to teach or disclose that a higher quality image is requested and/or a change from a still image to a moving image on the basis of voice information. Thus, Kitahara is also distinguishable from the present invention and fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Kamata.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, claims 11, 21, 34, 44, 46-51, 53, 60-63, 67-69, 73 and 77 are believed to be allowable over Kitahara in view of Kamata. Additionally, claims 12-20, 35-43, 45, 52, 54-59, 64-66, 70-72 and 74-76 are also believed to be allowable based on their dependency on the above claims. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

AUTHORIZATIONS

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for filing this application, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4391. A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: December 31, 2001

By: Mark D. Pratt
Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Morgan & Finnegan
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154